

ONLY ONE DIME
OCT 18 1909

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 12, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. III

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 16, 1909

No. 3

College instructors do not understand the problems of the secondary school, and with the rarest exceptions are not competent to direct preparatory work or to give good advice about it. This proposition will, no doubt, be disputed, first of all by the college man himself, but every thoughtful schoolmaster will recognize its truth. Whenever we call in a college man to address a meeting of schoolmasters we find at the end of a few sentences that we have a theorist before us with little or no practical grasp of his problem. . . . The preparatory course, as our system is now arranged, is dictated absolutely by the college entrance requirements, and these requirements at present are so mischievous in two ways that they spell ruin unless we can hope for early relief. It is useless and hopeless to demand good secondary teaching as long as we are bound by a rigid system which first kills interest, and secondly puts a premium on 'cramming' processes and inter-linear translations. Nor can we get far while we are compelled by small differences and irregularities to waste a large proportion of our strength and time as is now the case.

These quotations are from a very suggestive article on College Requirements in Latin and The School Curriculum, which appeared in the September number of *The Educational Review*. The author, Mr. F. M. De Forest of the Houston School, Spokane, argues very strongly for uniform entrance requirements and an examination which will test the student's capacity to read Latin. He accuses the colleges of insincerity in making particular requirements and maintains that from the results of the entrance examinations it is evident that the differences are nominal and not real, that no college has a standard which is perceptibly higher than that of the others, "as every secondary teacher knows from experience".

He makes, as his contribution to the solution of the problem, a strong plea for teaching Latin, in a general way—not necessarily in every particular—much as French and German are taught. He thinks the requirements ought to be particularly sight translation of prose and poetry, supplemented by composition and a minute examination upon certain small required works. "Some such solution as this", he says, "is our only hope if Latin is to stem the tide". Incidentally he urges that all words in sight passages not in my numbered list should be explained in foot-notes unless they are obvious derivatives.

The main points of Mr. De Forest's paper have been expressed in various places by different teachers. His presentation is, however, distinguished by refreshing candour and a disposition not to mince

matters which may have a good effect. Certain it is that many teachers are still unconvinced as to the necessity of changing our methods of teaching. This lack of conviction is shown particularly in their attitude towards the use of a prescribed vocabulary and the employment of sight translation on examinations.

Several points should, however, be particularly emphasized. First, sight translation cannot be insisted upon in any scheme of instruction if the college examination does not give it prominence. The practical teacher who has to put his pupils through college examinations in which sight translation is valued at only twenty per cent will neglect it almost entirely and put the time on the prepared work. He will say, perhaps somewhat cynically, "I can cram my students for the translation of the set passages so that they can pass the examinations; and it is practically better for me to spend all of my time on that than on work which will have such small results on the examination".

In the second place many teachers think that if the requirement of prepared work is lessened it will result in lessening the time devoted to the study of Latin in the schools. If we require two books of Caesar instead of four, they urge, no matter what we say about sight translation, the school will teach two books of Caesar instead of four. Nothing could be more fallacious. The extension of the examinations in sight reading instead of lessening the work in Latin increases it. If the pupil is required to translate at sight a given passage with substantial accuracy, and the test is applied severely, not only as much Latin but even more will have to be read in the schools. The essential for translation at sight is much practice and intensive teaching. Hence those who ask that more emphasis be laid on sight translation are in no way conniving at a diminution in the requirements in Latin.

In the third place, there is a great prejudice against prescribing any list of words on the ground that it tends to make the teaching mechanical. Students, it is said, will cram the word-lists and not learn as much Latin as they did by the old method. Now no sensible teacher believes that the mere committing to memory of a list of words is going to be of any service at all, but it is likewise eminently reasonable that teachers should have before them a certain pre-

scribed list of words so that (1) their study of vocabulary may be confined within a definite range and (2) that they may be able to read examination papers and make tests with assurance. Many teachers say that unusual words should be explained. But this is just the difficulty. What are the unusual words? My experience is that hardly any two teachers will agree on that point unless they have made studies in comparative word-frequency. No, a prescribed list of words does not mean cramming that list; it means restricting the teachers in the schools to certain definite limits, so that there shall be no waste of time and no uncertainty. With such a list there is ample opportunity for exhaustive study, if you choose, in word formation, in derivation, in semasiology, and in the numberless matters which come up in word study. The proper list has not yet been prepared. It should, in my opinion, be confined largely to primitives, with instruction in derivation; but the absence of a proper list should not prejudice us against the employment of such a list when prepared.

G. L.

THE VALUE OF THE CLASSICS: AN OUTSIDER'S VIEW¹

Following all the traditions of modern specialization, the task which I have assumed this evening is one from which any student of modern literature should respectfully retreat. For many years the field of the Classics and that of modern literature have each been regarded by their respective votaries as private domains about which there has been erected a high wall. If, perchance, like the Lover in the Romance of the Rose, any modern student should be so bold as to penetrate into the garden of the Classics and there seek to woo the Muses of Greek and Latin poetry, he has been confronted by the dire figures of jealous guardians, who have demanded his passports in terms of philology, mythology, archaeology and text criticism. Lacking the requisite papers he has been shown out the gate of the garden to which none but those initiated in the processes of the classical seminary claim entrance. To lay aside figurative language, is it not true that the man who occupies himself exclusively with the problems presented by the modern languages and literatures is still regarded in England and America as possessing a mind of inferior calibre, inadequate to fathom the mysteries entailed by study for the classical tripos or in the classical seminar?

There is some ground for this assumption on the part of scholars upon your side of the fence. Where I am surrounded by such a phalanx of stalwart Greeks and Romans, I shall take good care not to antagonize you at the outset. I freely admit that the study of modern philology has not yet been put

even in our universities upon the footing of dignity and thoroughness which has long been occupied by classical philology. In our secondary schools, to our shame be it said, the teaching of French and German as living tongues is for the most part a laughable farce. It will continue to be so as long as the instruction in these branches is put into the unhallowed hands of football coaches or into the mild grip of lady drawing-teachers. However, a movement in the right direction has been started in many of the schools here represented, and we shall live to see better things. The time may yet come when the training in English, French and German grammar will be as efficient as the training in Greek and Latin grammar is at present.

Personally, I am much interested in increasing the efficiency of the modern language instruction in our secondary schools. 'Know a little and know it well' is a doctrine which I have preached upon more than one occasion. But it is not for that purpose that I am here tonight. When the officers of your Association did me the honor of asking me to make some remarks this evening, we had a very clear idea of what was expected. They were at some pains to explain that nothing serious was required or desired. It was made very clear by them to me that you would resent any attempt at this time to improve your minds, but that you would sit amiably by while someone discoursed in an innocuous fashion upon the beauties of your classical heritage as seen by a layman. "Come into our garden", they said, "and have a look around. Tell us what you think of our flowers and our methods of cultivation. We shall be glad to hear what you say. Of course you understand that everything is laid out in the best way, and we don't promise to change any of the paths or the flower beds; but you are perfectly free to suggest any improvements you may think fit".

It is, then, as an outsider, as a student of Romance literature, that I speak to you tonight. But I venture to say that there is no one of you who excels me in my admiration for the beauty of classical poetry, or who believes more thoroughly in the advantage of a training in Latin for every schoolboy in the land. The day when, in the folly of that cry for a *practical* education, Latin was allowed to slip from the required list to the elective list was to my mind a sorry day for American education. The results have been disastrous to the mental grip, the ability to concentrate, and the appreciation of accuracy in the rising generation. For there was not at that time, and there is not yet, any substitute for the mental drill in linguistics imposed by the study of Greek and Latin grammar. If Professor Barrett Wendell can say so as a teacher of English, I crave the right to repeat it as a teacher of the Romance languages. Verily, my heart sinks when I find a student in my courses whose preparation consists

¹ This paper was read at the meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Haverford, Pa., April 24, 1909.

of hours in a laboratory, half-days spent in drawing steam-engines and in dissecting harmless little beasts. How can anyone make rapid progress in the study of the modern languages, if he is ignorant of Latin etymology and syntax? How can anyone appreciate the beauty of our modern schools of poetry, if he has not a knowledge, if only in translation, of the masterpieces of Greek literary art? I have said it to modern language teachers, and know no reason why I should not repeat it to you: "I know of no foundation study in the curriculum of our secondary schools which could less easily be dispensed with than the study of Latin as far at least as the college entrance requirements". To my mind any course which omits Latin should be branded as an inferior course, taken only by students of marked intellectual deficiency. Now, I have no love for mathematics. It was the only subject which ever caused me sleepless nights, and embarrassing failure. I am willing to put up mathematics alongside of Latin as a school subject required of everyone. And yet, is it not true that the average man could better dispense with algebra and geometry than he could with the essentials of the Latin grammar and vocabulary. Let us be very practical, since that is the pass-word nowadays. For myself, I have never had occasion to use more mathematics than was contained in the four processes of arithmetic and, occasionally, when times are good, the computation of interest. But what subject lies nearer to our mother tongue than the Latin? How can I express myself grammatically, or how can I make any intelligent use of words without an appreciation of the fundamental principles of Latin grammar and the main currents of Latin etymology? Let us leave literary appreciation out of the question for the moment; for the appeal to literary appreciation will not win converts now as it once did. You must be practical and keep your feet on the ground. So we may put the matter on the lowest footing. Before a man has anything to say, he should sharpen the tool with which to say it. Before a man undertakes to speak or write his thoughts he must possess the language which he proposes to use. No permanent or discriminating audience can be gained by the man who is illiterate. Point out, if you can, a masterpiece of human thought which is not composed in the best style that was accessible in his day to the author. Our schools, yea, our universities are turning out hundreds of young people who in this sense are illiterate. They cannot express or spell their thoughts in plain English. They have left undone something that they ought to have done,—or been made to do. They have missed the one essential to a straight-thinking being. One may very well sometimes dispense with the essential in order to possess the luxury, but not in linguistic work.

Enough has been said to show very plainly that

I wish to be considered a party to an intelligent study of the Classics in our schools as a preparation for all future work in language study, including the use of the mother tongue. Those of you who teach the Classics will certainly all agree with what has been said. Indeed, you knew it all before. If I am to give you any food for thought upon this frivolous occasion, I must assume another view-point. Thus far, we have been regarding the Classics chiefly as a training for the schoolboy or girl. We have tried to present the Classics as an unequalled food for the production of gray matter in the soft and malleable brain of a fifteen-year-old. My principal concern, however, this evening, is to speak of the humanistic value of the Classics in the cultivation of a literary taste which shall prove a guide and a solace in after life.

To my mind the teacher of the Classics should never lose from view this ultimate and more generous interpretation of his mission. As a teacher I would insist that the classical student be drilled thoroughly in grammar, syntax and etymology. That much is to be regarded as the *sine qua non*. But I would also have it that the classical student be at least exposed to some literary and artistic comment from a sympathetic teacher. Perhaps he will not catch the enthusiasm of his teacher. Indeed, only one here and there will catch it. But all should be exposed to it. You must sow beside all waters. From time to time some rich, full grain will spring up to your credit. From *your* class-rooms must come the poets, historians, philosophers, moralists, novelists, critics and editors, unless we are to admit that American literature is to be a hodge-podge of stock-markets, wheat pits, trolleys and dirigible balloons,—a literature lighted by electricity and with the divorce courts to furnish the love motive. It is with a very high appreciation, then, of your opportunities, that I venture to suggest that frequently they are missed.

Let me be more explicit and state my own case—a typical one. Twenty years ago I left a school in the adjoining city, trained to a fine point for the Arts course in a nearby college. In Greek, Xenophon and Homer had furnished the pabulum, in Latin Caesar, Cicero, Vergil and Nepos. There were no mysteries for me at that time in scansion, quantities, figures of speech, syntax or mythological allusion. Every rule in the grammar had been learned by heart, all the forms had been committed with scrupulous exactness; there was no possibility of failure except through deficiency of the necessary vocabulary. You understand, I trust, that this is said after twenty years in no spirit of boasting, but as a belated tribute to a master who believed in thoroughness and in accuracy. I can never repay the debt. But his system made all the Greek and Latin work in college child's play, and has been to me

a constant spur to raise the study of modern grammar to a like degree of efficiency. It would seem that the prompt, intelligent grasp which enables a student to see directly through the intricacies of an involved grammatical construction is little less desirable and far more useful than the intelligence which enables him to undertake successfully the solution of a problem in geometry. Yet, what can we do in our modern language classes, when we have to do with students, otherwise intelligent, who do not know the distinction between a transitive and an intransitive verb, the active and passive voice, a direct and an indirect question, a future indicative and a pluperfect subjunctive, a more vivid future condition and a condition contrary to fact in past time? Such a student sees no reason why we may not have a contrary to fact condition in future time! You think such ignorance is impossible in these days of grace? I assure you I am not exaggerating, as you can see for yourselves in any modern language classroom where students are poorly taught. The whole nomenclature of grammatical study runs the risk of going by the board since children have been allowed of their own free will to substitute the study of modern languages for the Classics in their elementary work.

But again, I say, this fault is not within your jurisdiction. Our pedagogical method men are to blame, aided and abetted by the popularity of kindergarten methods in secondary education and the mushy attitude of weak-backed parents. To return to my subject. As has been said, twenty years ago I possessed a very comfortable knowledge of Greek and Latin syntax. But that is all. The beauty of the Iliad and the Aeneid had escaped me; the strategy and historical style of Caesar were never regarded; the eloquence of Cicero was not called to our attention. In other words, were it not for my profession which has necessitated a frequent re-dipping into the springs of classic origins, my classical studies would stand me today for an unremitting drill in grammar and prosody, and nothing more. *Forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvat.* Yes, I am glad to be still able to parse a sentence. But it is not the main thing to me nowadays. Grammar is not going to charm middle age, nor is it going to call back the weary business man of a winter evening to the perennial sources of classic delight. There must be some other memory. You must have sowed some other seed in this fallow ground of youth committed to your charge. You must give the student some idea of the Greek and Latin civilization which produced these masterpieces, which are immortal even though they be massacred at the rate of fifty lines a day. They die daily, but they live on in the class-rooms of the ages. Give your students a little history, a little archaeology, a little biography—not for purposes of examination, but for culture only to stimulate their

interest in whatsoever things are lovely and of good report. Mr. A. C. Benson has said in *The Schoolmaster*: "To omit intellectual enjoyment from our programme, to pass over one of the strongest of boyish faculties, seems to me the kind of mistake that will be regarded some years hence as both pitiable and ludicrous". Now almost every class in a large school has a future great soul in it who is going to be kindled by what is great and good in your field. It is worth while to reach that soul alone. But every class has in it a number of souls that will be weary and sad at the age of forty or fifty unless they have some source of literary joy and satisfaction to which they can hark back and be filled. The bare text will perhaps not suffice to lure them back. But if in their recollections the text suggests the accompaniment of noble architecture, intense politics, high philosophy, thrilling military expeditions, sweet lyrics and soul-stirring dramas—if all this goes, however vaguely, with the memories of the classical class-room, do you not think that the mature man will more often be prompted to open again his old books and live his youth over again? For, as Sainte-Beuve says,

there comes a time in life when our wanderings are finished, when our experiences are concluded. Then there is no more lively delight than to study and to ponder over what we know; to enjoy what we feel, to see over and over again the people we love,—pure joy of the heart and of taste in all its maturity.

Or, as one of your own writers has said,

These studies are alike the food of youth, the delight of old age, the ornament of prosperity, the refuge and comfort of adversity; a delight at home, and no hindrance abroad; they are companions by night and in travel, and in the country.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, I can imagine a venerable old man of eighty, buffeted by the blows of inconstant fortune, sitting down and finding solace in Plato and Homer and Vergil, or in the works of a Milton or a Tennyson who are steeped in classic lore; but I hesitate to contemplate the old age of a man who is driven for his philosophy and moral support to Mr. Robert Herrick's *Together* or the *Letters* of a Self-made Merchant to his Son. Surely, the last stage of such an one is worse than the first.

It is to be noticed that the reading men in our colleges are for the most part in the Arts course, and that means yet, thank Heaven, men who have studied some Latin, though less Greek. So that it could be shown that as teachers of the Classics you have to a great extent the moulding of literary habits, the shaping of literary tastes. I knew a gentleman who would not object to being called a practical business man, who knows the value of assets both material and intellectual. He had two sons, of whom one was destined to become a physician, and the other a manufacturer. Each of them looked towards a distinctly scientific career. He made both of them study Latin and Greek and take the Arts course for

four years. When asked why he did so, he replied: "I want my boys to have a thorough classical training before they go into special work. They will never be any the worse for it". I tell you, if there were more fathers who laid down the law in that way, we should have stronger intellectual fiber in our colleges and more resourceful men in middle life. More people would read Plutarch, Marcus Aurelius, Montaigne, Pascal, Newman and Emerson, and fewer people would waste their time on Anthony Hope and Stanley Weyman; there would be more readers of the quarterlies and the reviews, and fewer college men would prostitute their minds on Short Stories, The Smart Set and The Black Cat. The present low state of taste in literature is not the fault of the individual reader. It is the fault of our system, which produces tired brains without any resource in good literature. It is partly within the sphere of your influence so to teach the Classics that you shall not disgust the neophyte with his task. Let him go out from your class-rooms with a pleasant memory, a broadened view and higher ideals in literary appreciation. Have you never noticed with what fond reminiscence the minds of middle-aged men go back to a teacher of the Classics who was filled with the milk of human kindness? There was such a man in this college a half century ago. His name is never mentioned in our alumni gatherings, but men whose hair is turning gray pay the tribute of a furtive tear and a happy smile to the memory of the luminous interpretation of the Classics as they were taught by Thomas Chase. He loved his subject, and he loved young men. His mission was to make them love the subject, and he did it. Can any of us teachers of literature set himself a higher goal?

You know more about it than I do: you will say that a dozen difficulties stand in your way. You have to contend with the opposition of parents, the dullness of students at the bottom of the class, the short hours of recitation, the pressure of the curriculum, and the cramming for entrance examinations. We have heard of some of the difficulties you have to contend with, and appreciate that you wage a ceaseless warfare. Perhaps you will say that this responsibility of literary culture lies altogether within the province of the college, and that you are solely occupied with laying a foundation. The latter consideration is surely the main one. Without it all subsequent progress is futile. But it is rather to the spirit of your instruction that I am referring. The student should constantly be led to remember that he is only working on the surface of a great mine of intellectual resource, into which you are qualifying him to dig. Or, to change the figure, instead of allowing him to grow short-sighted, you should open up to him distant horizons of delight, into which he will be able to pass and roam at his own

sweet will. Many students will rise up to bless you for such a presentation of your subject, and, inspired by what you have allowed to be seen, will elect a fair proportion of classical studies in their collegiate work, instead of dropping them at entrance for the more facile courses in which they are allowed by complacent faculties to dabble vainly.

For what American education must produce before this Republic falls irretrievably into the hands of demagogues and ward politicians is *men*. Not mere machines who can gain a livelihood and who would sell their vote for gain, but men who know what they believe and why they believe it—men of principle who know the lessons of the Past and who realize that to make right prevail, the individual conviction must be carried out in deeds.

There has been a good deal of talk in England about the inadequacy of the old-fashioned methods in English education. You know what defects have been found even by Englishmen in the exclusively classical education with its mediaeval ear-marks, to which the best blood in England has for centuries been subjected. But we may question whether England has not had a larger list of university men in politics during the last two centuries than any other civilized nation of the world. This is not because a classical course prepares a man directly for a political or diplomatic career, but because in England education is rightly held to carry with it definite responsibilities of leadership in public life. France, like our own Republic, has fallen into the hands of demagogues and professional politicians, men who are in it for the money and who seem at times incapable of any disinterested sentiments or generous sense of personal responsibility. Some account for the present materialism of French politics by the falling off of classical instruction. But if I did not believe that there is a possible connection between the change in our curriculum and the sordid attitude of men in public life in our own country, I should not afflict you with these remarks. If the government of our states and cities is falling into the control of men who exploit them for their own gain, it is of course the fault of the educated men who do not raise a finger to prevent this state of affairs. What are they doing in the meantime? They are too busy to take any part in affairs for which they are not remunerated. They are *practical* men, the victims of a *practical* education, accustomed to reckon all values in dollars and cents rather than in honor, duty and intellectual leadership. They have attended school and they have gone to college for the definite purpose of fitting themselves for their life work, which in their case means to make money.

Now I have felt for some time that a salubrious effect upon our business and political life would be exerted by a more general knowledge and love of the Classics. It would probably be hard to show

that our teachers of Latin and Greek take the responsibility of citizenship any more seriously than the ward politician, or that their business ethics are on a higher plane than those of the average honest merchant. But that is not the point. I am not concerned with the professional classical scholar: he is at any rate usually not a scallawag. I am speaking of the laymen, the graduates of our High Schools, the men who never got beyond Vergil and who have immersed themselves perforce in the affairs of this life. For such men there could be found something steadying in the possession of what we may call the spirit of classical culture. He who has worshipped on this mount, where the air is redolent with high discourse and dignified methods, cannot come down into the world without experiencing the beneficial effects of a tonic. All that is cheap, vulgar and showy in literature and art repel him. He has no use for it, because he has been shown a more excellent way. Duty and service seem written in more indelible characters before the boy who has done the daily task and who has held commerce with the great artists of an age whose character is fixed beyond all change or attack of criticism. To reread the Aeneid, for example, is to the mature man an inspiration: what noble standards of conduct were there transmitted to the Romans; what grand characters in action, unweariedly striving to reach the goal set by Fate; what dignified poise and reserve in the literary presentation of the material; and finally what pictures of the heroes in peace and war crowd upon the delighted reader! These indeed are, as Sainte-Beuve says, pure joys of the heart and of taste in all its maturity.

If I have felt any message to deliver to-night to you teachers of the Classics, it is to remind you of a great privilege that is yours. It cannot be said that it is yours exclusively, because it is the privilege in some measure of all of us who hand on the great records of mankind. *Science* looks forward; we look backward, but with the knowledge that what we can learn in the Past has been given to us for our profit in the Future. A knowledge of the triumphs and failures of humanity in the countless ages of the Past is essential to a right understanding and perspective of the Present. Some lessons were learned long ago. Acquaintance with the Past saves time in making useless experiments. As the French say, "it is no use to break in a door that is not locked".

But the privilege is yours preëminently because your subjects belong like mathematics to the aristocracy of the curriculum. There is an odor of sanctity in the classical room. You may think at times that the odor is pretty stuffy and the class half asleep. But the public speaks to you hat in hand, and of your subjects with bated breath. You have the inside track, if you only manage to hold it.

It is generally felt by educators and the public at large that the boy who has 'served time' in Latin preparation is mentally stronger than one who has not. I believe it is absolutely true nine times out of ten. The boy who has been well trained in even one of the Classics is seldom slipshod in his methods of study. Many who have not been so trained are worse than slipshod; they are unqualifiedly illiterate.

It has been my purpose, as stated at the outset, to upset none of your plans or methods. I am old-fashioned enough to care little for the methods over which the big guns in our Teachers' Colleges fire their broadsides and merely create a great flutter in the normal schools and district boards. What counts in instruction in the Classics above all is the man who is doing the teaching.

I should be happy if any word has been said which will dignify your task in your own minds and which will send you back to your work conscious of the extent of your silent influence upon the taste and standards of the rising generation.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

W. W. COMFORT.

REVIEWS

The Acropolis of Athens. By Martin L. D'Ooge. New York: The Macmillan Company (1908). xx + 405 + v pp. \$4.00.

This volume is a notable contribution to our knowledge of ancient Athens. It far surpasses any single work thus far produced on the Acropolis. It reflects great credit on American scholarship. It will long continue to be the definitive work on the Acropolis.

Professor D'Ooge modestly states in the preface that "the present volume is an attempt to give a summary of the most important contributions to this history (of the Acropolis) and to state the results of personal study of this site and of the ruins upon it". But he has worked through his material so carefully and met the problems encountered so forcefully that the work may be regarded as an original and important contribution to knowledge.

Having in mind his two classes of readers—the general reader and the specialist—the author leaves to notes and appendixes a great mass of dry detail that would interrupt the steady flow of his narrative. He treats his subject mainly in the historical or chronological order, yet adopting the topographical method whenever it best suits his purpose.

After describing in minute detail the natural features of the Acropolis, the author presents the evidence of its original occupation as sanctuary, citadel, and the residence of prehistoric kings (Chapter I). He then discusses the earliest historical period down to the Persian Wars, dwelling particularly on the Pelargicon, the Old Temple of Athena, and the remains of Pre-Persian sculpture (Chapter II). He next treats the period from the Persian destruction

down to the Age of Pericles. This leads to an investigation concerning the rebuilding of the walls, the earlier Propylon and Parthenon, and the remains of sculpture of this period (Chapter III). Under The Age of Pericles (Chapter IV), he discusses, with due appreciation of the scientific and aesthetic aspects of his theme, the Parthenon, the Erechtheum, the Propylaea, and the Temple of Wingless Victory. Then follows a treatment of the temples and shrines on the southern slope of the Acropolis, with special attention to the theater of Dionysus (Chapter V). An historical sketch is given in the next chapter of the Acropolis in the Hellenistic and Roman periods with a detailed account of the descriptive tour of Pausanias (Chapter VI). The closing chapter treats the later history from the close of the Roman period up to the present time, during the Byzantine, Frankish, Florentine, Turkish and Modern Greek periods (Chapter VII). The Notes are valuable for the references they give to the sources and to the works of other topographers. The volume concludes in three appendixes for the benefit of the specialist, one giving Frazer's translation of Pausanias's description of the Acropolis and its monuments, and a select bibliography, a second discussing the Pelargicon, and a third giving an exhaustive treatment of the Old Athena Temple. The volume is rich in the possession of nine photogravures, seven plans and one hundred and thirty-four illustrations in the text.

The history of the Acropolis during and since the age of Pericles is fairly well known. Differences of opinion apply only to minor details, and the work done by Professor D'Ooge in covering the period from Pericles to the present may be regarded as final. Since the excavations of 1885-1889 scientific investigation has been directed chiefly to the Pre-Persian period, and has centered largely about Dörpfeld's discovery of the Old Athena Temple. Dr. Dörpfeld is the acknowledged master of this early period, and all other topographers feel called upon to say whether they adopt or dissent from his opinions. Professor D'Ooge gratefully acknowledges his debt of gratitude to Professor Dörpfeld "not only for the results of his investigations, without which no true history of the Acropolis could be written, but also for his great kindness in reading the larger part of my book in manuscript and in giving me the benefit of his technical and minute acquaintance with every phase of the subject". Yet Professor D'Ooge dissents from some of Dr. Dörpfeld's interpretations and presents cogent reasons for his point of view. In all these matters he presents clearly, first, the standpoint of Dörpfeld, then that of other topographers, and finally his own.

The chief points of dissent held by Professor D'Ooge are as follows:

(1) Dörpfeld believes that the Pelargicon continued to exist during the Periclean Age; Professor

D'Ooge thinks it was destroyed when the Propylaea was erected.

(2) Professor D'Ooge does not accept Dörpfeld's theory of the history of the Pre-Persian Athena temples on the Acropolis.

(3) Professor D'Ooge does not believe with Dörpfeld that the Old Athena temple continued to exist after the erection of the Erechtheum. He presents, in his text and in appendix III, Dörpfeld's theory, his own theory, and the views of Petersen, Milchhoefer, Furtwängler, Michaelis, and others, so that his statement of the case is entirely complete and satisfactory. Yet at the close he adds,

I would not be understood as claiming that I have disproved Dörpfeld's theory of the continued existence of the Old Athena Temple. My chief aim in this discussion has been to set forth the ground of the view I have preferred to take, realizing all the while that this view is by no means free from difficulties which I have not been able to remove wholly to my own satisfaction, but which seem to me still to be less numerous and formidable than those involved in the theory of the brilliant discoverer of the structure that has been the cause of all this controversy.

As one who has investigated the Old Athena Temple, the Pelargicon and the Dionysium in Limnis problems, in connection with my edition of the Attica of Pausanias, let me say that I feel that Professor D'Ooge's concluding statement is all that can be said about any of these questions. Owing to the scant and unsatisfactory references to them in ancient authors, we have not enough data at hand to solve the problems, and there will always be differences of interpretation of the passages at hand. They are, as it were,—if scholars will pardon the homely illustration—the pigs-in-the-clover puzzles of Athenian topography: when one passage slips comfortably into a theory another slips out. Hence all we can say is that Professor D'Ooge's thorough treatment offers the best and latest presentation of the problems involved and will long be the most authoritative statement of the subject.

It is gratifying in reading a book such as we are considering to turn from the realm of topographical disputation, to the realm of established fact in the study of the surviving architecture and sculpture of the Periclean Age. Here, too, our author's treatment will prove satisfying in both subject matter and style.

The author states in his preface that this book was originally intended to be one of a series of Handbooks of Classical Archaeology, but gradually outgrew the limits of a handbook. Having now the larger works of Gardner on Ancient Athens and D'Ooge on the Acropolis, the desideratum is a Handbook on the Topography and Monuments of Ancient Athens, of suitable size and treatment to be available as a text book in college courses on classical archaeology.

MITCHELL CARROLL.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY.

